R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 226 UD 005 529

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS, WHERE EMOTIONS AND EXPERIENCES MEET. EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED, APPENDIX B.

BY- SUMMERS, LINDEN D., JR. LETTIS, DONALD R.

PUB DATE 22 JUN 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUMMER PROGRAMS, *EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES, *DROPOUTS, *ART EDUCATION, *MOTIVATION TECHNIQUES, EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, CHANGING ATTITUDES, MALES, COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT, TEACHER INTERNS, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ACADEMIC ASPIRATION, ART ACTIVITIES, FOLLOWUP STUDIES, COLGATE UNIVERSITY

A SUMMER PROGRAM WAS ESTABLISHED AT COLGATE UNIVERSITY (1) TO MOTIVATE ADOLESCENT MALE DROPOUTS TOWARD EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND (2) TO ENCOURAGE IN THEM MORE POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD ART AND SOCIETY. THE PROGRAM CENTERED AROUND AN ART CLASS SINCE ART WAS AN AREA ABOUT WHICH STUDENTS HAD EXPERIENCED THE LEAST FRUSTRATION AND FAILURE. STUDENTS WERE ENCOURAGED TO HAVE PERSONAL CONTACT WITH INTERN TEACHERS ON THE CAMPUS. IN THE ART CLASS STUDENTS WERE MOST SUCCESSFUL AT CREATING ABSTRACT NONREPRESENTATIONAL WORKS, WHICH DID NOT DEMAND A TALENT FOR DRAWING. IN GENERAL, THEIR EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS SEEMED TO IMPROVE, AND NO MAJOR DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS AROSE DURING THE PROGRAM'S TWO SUMMERS OF OPERATION. A BRIEF FOLLOWUP REPORT ON THE PARTICIPANTS IS INCLUDED. THIS DOCUMENT, AN INVITED JOINT ADDRESS WAS DELIVERED AT A CONFERENCE, "THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST AND THE DISADVANTAGED," (STAR LAKE, NEW YORK, SUMMER CAMP OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT POTSDAM, JUNE 22, 1966). (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED020226

UD 005 539

APPENDIX B: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

WHERE EMOTIONS & EXPERIENCES MEET[1]

Linden D. Summers, Jr.[2], and Donald R. Lettis[3]

[LDS]: At the risk of appearing condescending, allow me to structure the field we plan to discuss. Under the broad heading of "Emotional Problems of the Disadvantaged", also to be considered further this evening in an address by Dr. Newman, and, analyzed yesterday so effectively by Barbara Mildram, Bob and I have chosen as our particular share or slice of this "myth or reality" to focus on our perception as to "where emotions and experiences meet."

Those of you who know me will not be surprised that I'm going to identify a set of assumptions before we go too far in pursuing our topic. The assumption underlying THAT procedure is simply my conviction that you have a right to know the rules of the game you're to play before it starts. But first, in pursuit of this cognitive map, let me sketch out how we plan to use, jointly, our 75 minutes. (There's a real danger here, in such forewarning: the skillful listener can decide beforehand which sections he wishes to attend to and rest comfortably during the other segments of our performance.)

With that two-edged caveat, we'll proceed. First, we'd like to identify the population we've built up our experiences with. Of course there's a risk in our generalizing from this to whatever one means when "disadvantaged children" are discussed. But since there's no general agreement, even in legislation affecting such students, I

[1]An invited joint address, delivered by the authors at a conference, "The School Psychologist and the Disadvantaged", Star Lake, N.Y. (Summer camp, State University Collete at Potsdam), 22 June 1966.

[2]Associate Professor, Colgate University
[3]Assistant Professor, Massachusetts College of Art

hope our experiences can be seen as having some carry-over value. In talking about our population, we'd like also to describe their environment - Camp Brace - the opportunity camp in which they're resident, since this is a highly relevant variable - albeit of indeterminate significance. To allow us more time to talk about our project and, of more importance, the implications we find arising from it, we've already given you some background materials. The slides that follow may make some of this more "alive".

After that background - stage-setting, if you will - Bob will continue my discussion, giving further perspective on our underlying assumptions. Next, a brief summary, with editorial comments, about the program itself - a sort of joint commentary on the campus experience. In concluding remarks, I'll include a rather brief follow-up of the boys involved in our past two years' experience. We'd suggest, then, using our "Reaction Panel & Discussion" period to draw implications from our experience and to spin off an armful of ideas, impressions and *obiter dicta* - with which we're amply equipped!

Now, to the underlying assumptions. To be perfectly candid, I can't say for sure how much of all this represents *a priori* thinking and how much a rationale developed after the fact. All I can say is that many of our ideas for the kind of program we wanted were pre-existent, in disorganized, inchoate form rather than in explicit formulation. Baldly stated, our interest was to hook these kids on the idea of education; we wanted, if you prefer more sophisticated jargon, to re-motivate them towards achievement in educational pursuits. Despite the casual way in which I tossed that off, don't be deceived: our efforts toward such a goal are deliberate. You see, we're not operating on the assumption that these kids are UN-

motivated; we are assuming - and this assumption can be viewed with some alarm, in terms of its far-reaching implications - that their aspirations, interests and goals are, in many respects, wrong.

Further, we're presuming to change - I guess you could read that as "correct" - them. God, how presumptuous! But the more we've thought about, and pondered over these basic assumptions, the more comfortable they've become. (I'm painfully aware, of course, that this could be read as "rationalization" and it may well be, but it's our perspective).

Well, what our program amounts to is a direct, deliberate assault on their value systems. Assuming that the Art Studio is, psychologically, a microcosm of the world - more on this later - we use experiences there and with our teaching interns to challenge previously held values. We deliberately shake 'em up; in providing a brand new, relatively ambiguous experience - ambiguous in terms of drawing conclusions or making judgments - and in showering them with what I hope is real and not feigned interest on the part of some exciting people in an environment in itself foreign, but presumably, positively perceived - the university campus, we force these boys to re-appraise themselves and their worlds.

Because we're concerned about the implications of our work, let me pause for a moment here to consider one aspect of this "assault". We mount a deliberate attack on their preconceived ideas about art and their own relation to it (hoping in a larger sense to mount the same attack on all aspects of their relationship to the world). But, as you'll appreciate from Bob's analysis - to come - while we seek a re-ordering of this relationship, we don't prescribe one for them. Aiming for change, we dictate neither direction nor amount. This, of course, salves our qualms regarding Machaviellian manipulation.

It also follows the implicit if not explicit motives of the Youth Camp concept. More on these points later; first, let's look in more detail at the "raw material" with which we start: the boys and the setting from which they come.

[SLIDES AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CLIENTELE, AND OF CAMP BRACE ITSELF]

Rather than generalized data, let me give you a case history of one of the boys; if one could create an "average" from such a heterogeneous group, Bill S. would certainly qualify.

[CASE HISTORY OF ONE CAMPER PRESENTED]

Given such a group, composed of permutations and combinations of Bill's, in a moment we'll talk about what we do with them. While it's somewhat off-beat, it's certainly not so esoteric that it couldn't be - and, for all we know, may be - reproduced almost anywhere. Your interest, though, I suspect, lies more in the WHY rather than the WHAT of our operation.

[DRL]: Consider for a moment how any of us might react to an unfamiliar incident or object. "I know what I like", is an evaluation often heard from one who is confronted by such diversified objects as a new car or an avante-garde work of art. This announcement may be a rejection or an acceptance and will be based not on aesthetic principles, in most cases, but rather on experiences which will have created a framework through which the confronted object can be viewed. In short an opinion, an evaluation, a prejudice has been expressed based on a set of values which have been established from past understandings. In art this understanding is particularly evident. In viewing a work by such artists as Pollock, Hofmann, or de Kooning, the viewer's response is often, "I know what I like and I don't like that". Because the framework through which a work of modern art is viewed is more complex than just realistic representation and because

the layman is often unfamiliar with these complex concepts, what he is really saying is, "I don't like what I don't understand". The Impressionist had to contend with this lack of understanding when the Establishment of 1870 was still promoting the concepts of neo-classicism. Today their art is thoroughly understood and therefore liked by all. What is not understood or that which is misunderstood is alien and therefore unacceptable.

It is not my purpose to show how this value system is formed. It is enough to say that while the majority will respond correctly to cultural stimuli, a few will elicit only negative replies - yet both groups have acquired their value standards from the same society. For the larger group, the external forces: environmental pressures and cultural standards are in harmony with their developmental processes and consequently have helped to develop an inner value system that will become a positive stabilizing force and lead to the conformity that our culture expects. He knows what he likes because he understands or has the equipment for understanding and therefore is capable of fitting the prescribed pattern.

The alienated individual, on the other hand, does not travel the same path. His actions are inappropriate, often unpredictable, and certainly unacceptable for those of us who have learned to make the right noises. He can understand the what but not the why - in effect his evaluation is, "I don't understand <u>why</u> I shouldn't be allowed to do as I please and because I don't understand, I don't like it".

It is with this type of individual that the program at Colgate is involved. We are not concerned with creating new values or imposing exterior standards as much as we are in providing a climate that will encourage a change in their attitude toward society, thus

allowing them a chance to re-evaluate their frame of reference. By providing a new atmosphere in which to work, situations and experiences that are oriented toward a positive educational attitude, and a human relationship that is both sincere and unique, we hope to provide a medium in which they could put their house in order.

[LDS]: Our program originated in our concern with what we rather grandiosely developed as a primary objective of the Camp Brace experience for a boy - his educational rehabilitation. Here we operated on some clearly defined principles - debatable, of course, but in a pragmatic sense, unassailable. Within our society, middle class practices and mores predominate; the clientele served by Camp Brace come from somewhere significantly below, and, quite possibly, alienated from that vast "norm". To salvage their lives, they need to come to know, to understand, even, hopefully, accept, a middle class way of life. We put it more brazenly: the way out, for these boys, is UP! How's the best way to get there? Education.

The Camp, as you know, has an educational program and makes deliberate efforts to maximize educational experiences. But, just as the early morning radio announcer faces the problem of limited listeners 'cuz no one wants to get up so early, we faced the awkward problem that these boys didn't exactly clamor to avail themselves of these magnificent opportunities. Parenthetically, there are serious implications to be drawn from this phenomenon: whose fault, so to speak, is it that they don't eagerly seize such a rich opportunity? More on that perhaps, in our discussion period. For now, suffice it to point out that we accepted, acknowledged their reluctance. So we looked for some way to get 'em hooked again, as we assume all of our children, at least in their early school years, are, on education. I'm sorry I can't recall, precisely, from those interminable dis-

cussions at Camp Brace, some 2 1/2 years ago, who first suggested a college campus experience. Though I'm sure it wasn't unique, it was a serendipidous event - of this, I'm positive if only because I know we hadn't followed the prescribed scholarly practice of viewing relevant literature first! I might as well assume - as I'd obviously prefer to - that it was my idea. Regardless of whose, all of us seized upon it, recognizing the stimulus, as well as the novelty, value of such an experience, for boys who were not considered as prospective college students. You'll realize all through this an inclination for the incongruous - to which impulse we've given full rein. (And bear in mind that this planning predated the current popularization for such rash juxtapositions. It's an interesting story in itself to recall some of the divers reactions on our staid old campus to such a proposal, but I'll resist the impulse to go into those!)

What to do with such a group? Our choice of the campus and on the art studio as a vehicle for such "re-motivation" was clearly deliberate. Let me ask Bob to take over for a few moments, pursuing our assumptions about the nature of an art experience and describing the campus program.

[DRL]: As Doc has said, the choice of a college campus for this project was by design. While it was felt that a totally new environment was needed for this experience, it was also realized that one created in a void would not serve a purpose. They were already participating in a camp and remedial program at Camp Brace and while the camp had changed their environment from urban to rural, it had also isolated them in the backwoods of Delaware County, to some extent exiled from the society that they were supposed to learn to live with. Bill Banks, the assistant director in 1964, had instituted a group of trips that were designed to bring the boys back to the city scene

and in contact with large groups of people. Because this program had seemed helpful in establishing contact with reality for the boys, it indicated that our program could be carried out in an atmosphere where many people were involved doing many and varied things. For most of the boys, the public school was the one symbol that loomed the largest to remind them of their alienation from society. For many, their troubles had started there in the form of the teacher, the principal, or the truant officer. We were dealing with school dropouts. How were we to bring them to an academic climate that did not have the same overtones - hostility and frustration - that they had left behind? We were certain that it would have to be a totally different one from the one they had just rejected. From this thinking evolved the idea of using Colgate University. One other factor seemed advantageous: the presence on campus of high school students who were attending summer classes would provide a peer group.

Because of their obligations to the camp program at Brace and also because of financial limitations, it was not possible to bring the boys to Colgate as residents. Instead it was decided that they would attend "college" on the same basis as the quasi-sophisticates, the other high school students who were being bussed in daily: only for classes and special activities. Our students would arrive in time for a morning class, have a period in which to explore the campus, participate in recreational activities, or communicate with the teacher interns who were to be part of the program, have lunch at one of the fraternity houses and return in the mid-afternoon to Camp Brace, unless a late activity kept them until evening. Except for the time of the art class, their schedule was purposely kept flexible to allow the interns a latitude of freedom for working out activities with the boys. These activities ranged all the way from group affairs

such as hoon-n-nannies, picnics, or a basketball game to private conversation between an intern and a boy as they walked to Chapel House, explored the library, or just sat under a tree.

The art program came about in much the same manner as did the choice of location. Our choice of art rather than some other subject came about for several reasons. While our students from Brace were not slow learners, they were far behind their peer group in most academic areas and you can be sure that these subjects did not head their list of preferred activities. If we expected a change in their attitude toward education, the chances that it would occur by giving them a class in an area in which their performance had been poor were slim indeed. Almost without exception, contact in classes such as math, science, and English meant defeat and it was therefore our task to hit upon an area where the least amount of frustration and lack of success had taken place. It was also important to hit upon an area where standards were not predetermined and where these standards offered an opportunity for measurement on an individual rather than a group basis. Art, among others, was a subject that offered such possibilities. It presented them an opportunity to work in an area where previous defeats and frustrations had been minimal, a course whose outcome was not colored by their academic deficiencies, and one that, while standards do exist, they are flexible and often ambiguous.

It must be understood that the art course we envisioned was not of the artsy-craftsy type: finger painting and leather-lacing, but rather an art program based on serious concepts and fine arts objectives. To offer them the first type in a condescending manner would be self-defeating: a patronizing approach was one thing that they neither wanted nor needed. We wanted to offer them a positive educational experience, one that would rekindle their interest in school work - not one that would try to pull the wool over their eyes, for their senses were keyed to this type of deception. As I look back, we may have unknowingly picked an area that had another appeal for our young outcasts. Traditionally the artist's relationship to society has been the myth of the bohemian, the beatnik, and the non-conformist: often a misfit to the point of being an outcast. He has been identified with everything from illicit sex to pot and LSD. The work produced by the artist-deviate also affords an attraction. Thousands of years ago the products of the stone age artists were said to hold magical powers. With modern art, the cycle seems to have been completed because it is viewed with much the same awe as must have been registered in the Lascaux Caves. Modern art speaks a message directed not to the masses but rather to a small elite group, the connoisseur. To be an artist or one who understands what the artist is saying is to be part of the "in group." What better role could we have stumbled upon for boys whose aspirations were directed toward the romantic rather than the pragmatic?

The choice of Colgate as the site for the project had another advantage. For several summers the graduate teaching intern program has been operating on the campus. This program involves master degree

candidates who would be doing their teaching internship either in the fall or the spring semester of that year. Here was a chance to give these teachers a chance to work with students on an informal basis. Part of this aspect did have a selfish motivation: to allow the interns an opportunity to get to know and associate informally yet intimately with a population of culturally disadvantaged youth, similar in many respects to students they would face in classrooms in the future, was the way Doc Summers wrote it up in his report of last summer's program. Yet the benefits of utilizing the interns in such a program could be twofold: mutually advantageous to both parties through an intimate personal relationship. It was hoped that this contact would give the boys a chance to talk out their concerns, to explore hitherto unaccessible areas of aspirations and to re-assess their thinking about education. In short, we were trying to point out through this personal contact that teachers were human like themselves and that they could be communicated with on a wave-length that was friendly rather than remote. This part of the program, while seemingly a frosting, perhaps held the key to our success or failure. How else were we to guide, steer, or lead these boys away from their alienated set of values toward a realistic standard if it could not be talked out with another fellow creature? Call it a loaded situation if you like, but it nevertheless gave the boys an opportunity to communicate with people who were neither too near nor too remote to their personal lives with whom they could share a confidence and who were themselves strongly oriented toward education. This perhaps was the closest we came to twisting their arms. We were counting on the human act of friendship to help bring about the change in attitude that we were after.

[LDS:] There are volumes inherent in our decision. Rejecting

logically-attractive remedial programs, or specific, content-oriented tutorials, despite such glaring needs to overcome the educational deficits of these boys, we sweep on to the grand premise - or fallacy, depending on your perspective. Let's throw 'em into a field in which they've probably had minimal, and most likely negative, experiences; we'll put 'em in a situation, consistent with our fascination for ambiguity, where standards are not so pat or objectively determinable as reading or some subject matter.

[DRL:] The enigma that we faced was to provide a positive educational experience in a specialized field, such as art, in which none of the boys showed any talent or skill. From the start we recognized this as only a minor problem because it was not our purpose to develop talented artists. Art talent is often based on the false premise that a drawing skill is the only or at least the most important skill that an artist must possess. While it is important in some specialized phases of art such as commercial illustration, cartooning, or figure drawing, it is not the most important in all. In fact it is not as important for a talented artist as say originality, a sense of design, a perceptiveness or an intuitive color sense, inventiveness in problem solving, or a feeling for two and three dimensional space: qualities that a student must have to go through art school today. The type of program that we were to give would utilize these qualities rather than the obvious one of drawing by the simplest means possible: we would avoid realistic representation. These were qualities that everyone possesses to a degree and so we were sure that the Camp Brace boys would be adequately equipped. It is also important to realize that we were not providing art as therapy, but rather as a legitimate course, one in which a degree of success could be attained that would be real and meaningful.

Before I tell you about the specifics of the course, let me state some of the generalities: assumptions that we made, how we handled criteria and what we were trying to achieve. I have already mentioned that we assumed a degree of skill to be present to insure a degree of success. Another assumption that was made and rightly so, concerned their behavior. Because the nature of their incarceration had been to some extent voluntary, it was felt that we need not be concerned with either discipline or hostility. The first year's group attended "college" without apprehensions or misgivings, in fact with a visible amount of eagerness. The danger of being suspended from the program may have held them in check. The charm and worldliness displayed by this group made one wonder who was doing what to whom. The second group displayed a different facade: while no hostility was evident, they did show a high degree of apprehensiveness, yet they were as well behaved as the first group.

Ambiguous and ever changing would be the best way to describe the criteria for the art course: no clear-cut standards and no models to emulate - except those that I found useful such as an interesting surface or abstraction. After being instructed on the method of manipulating a medium, the students were directed to begin working toward a product. This product was only defined as an abstract composition, a woodcut, or a piece of sculpture. In my eyes, and I hoped in theirs as well, all completed products would contain successful elements. This is not to say that I automatically praised all that was done - even they would have seen the fallacy of this approach. All criticism took place on an individual plane and in talking about a picture or a statue, I could always find parts that were executed well or gave a pleasing result. These qualities could be praised honestly and objectively - remembering that they resulted either

intuitively or by accident, never because they were stated as an objective in the first place. Just as objectively, after the successes had been located and commented upon, other parts could be talked about and changes suggested for improvement: a change of a value, or hue, combining several shapes into one, or adding or subtracting parts for balance. Were these works theirs or mine? It is always questionable in an art school when the work of an entire class becomes too good as to whether it is because of good instruction or simply because the idea: of the instructor are being reflected through the work of his students. In our situation, did learning take place? I doubt it, but remember we were not trying to develop art talent and our objective had been reached when a visual success, in the form of their work, had been produced. The most successful results developed out of those media that were directed toward abstractions, such as oil painting, and the least rewarding were in such areas as figure drawing, which was almost completely representational. Even the boys recognized this success and would say, "Man, that's abstract painting" or, as one put it, "a non-objectional picture." Later I would like to comment on why I felt that this success should be so.

What were we trying to achieve through the art program? It has already been stated that a successful educational experience was hoped for... could we be satisfied with this? Would this bring about a change in attitude and thus cause a new interest in education for our charges? I believe that the choice of art offered more: side effects that were equally important. Such things as: their being able to identify with modern art or today's artist would fit more closely with their romantic aspirations than other disciplines, or their association, on an equal footing (the interns participated in the art class and did no better or no worse than the Camp Brace

boys), with people who they considered, only a few months before, probably superior and certainly alien to their way of life, or even the realization that art could be as manly as, say, boxing or girl watching.

[LDS:] What sort of things happened? In effect, we said: let's turn them loose in an Art Studio, under competent and enthusiastic, demanding yet sympathetic - all four adjectives are vital - instruction, to see what happens to them in the process. In art work, they can't, or at least can't easily, use the presumably inhibiting effect of past educational failure; the product is too hard to judge.

Further, equality of starting point is at least hypothetically possible. Our program wasn't aimed at developing, or even uncovering latent artistic ability. It was aimed at carrying an individual to a point of real satisfaction with his own accomplishment.

[DRL:] In order to set the tone for this program, the film Lust for Life was shown at the first class meeting. This had two purposes: the first being to break down any pre-conceived ideas that art was only for children, sissies, or women, and secondly to show them the life of a man who, regardless of his environment, his limitations, and his alienation from society, had been able to make a life for himself that had a purpose. As you can imagine, it was not difficult for the boys to identify with Van Gogh as his miseries unfolded on the screen. The film was followed by a brief lecture about art as it affected the life of man through the ages, its role as a form of communication, and its place in today's world. The lecture was illustrated with reproductions from periods in Western man's development from the Renaissance to the present, showing several works by Van Gogh that has been illustrated in the film.

The remainder of the two week period was spent on the art

projects themselves, designed to encompass several media and techniques in order to give variety and thus hold their attention. Attentiveness was originally considered a problem because we had been warned that at camp interest would lag quickly in activities such as shop or school work. To our relief, this problem occurred only once and then only because of a miscalculation on our part. More about that later. For all other periods, the hour and a half was utilized to its fullest and also productively and in several instances to the point of having to pry them out of the studio for other activities.

As I have stated, not all projects achieved the same degree of success. Let me first describe those that were the most successful, leaving till last those that came close to being failures. The first medium to be explored and the one that reached the highest degree of success was oil painting. The demonstration itself consisted of showing them how to handle the palettes, brushes, and painting knives; how to mix colors, and various methods of applying the paint to the canvas. The objective was to make a design on the canvas using only shapes that represented no real objects. Some got their design by using geometrical forms while others drew with charcoal lines that were straight, curved, or jagged and which created free forms when they intersected. As color was applied, they were encouraged to achieve <u>balance</u> by using one color in several places, <u>variety</u> by changing a color's value or intensity and trying to obtain different surface textures by applying the paint not only with a brush but also by using the palette knife, <u>unity</u> by limiting the number of colors and shapes, and <u>rhythm</u> by repeating in a logical manner color, shape, line, and texture. This instruction took place as I talked to each one and as I found parts of their work that could be objectively praised. As the period ended, many had completed their painting, a

few thought that they had but as I pointed out could stand to make several changes and a couple ,although they had been working diligently, still needed more time for filling in blank spaces. As brushes were being cleaned and palettes scraped, you could hear their enthusiastic comments on the ease with which they had created a modern masterpiece. It was fortunate that the first studio period could be cut off on this high note. The following day they were ready to continue painting, but I knew that we had better leave well enough alone and go on to other things.

The lessons that followed saw us doing such things as block printing, sculpture, mask making, figure drawing, water color painting, and scratch board drawing. A day was permitted for the presentation of each and at the end, two class periods were allowed to finish incomplete projects. Those that had completed everything were allowed to work in any medium that wanted to and the majority returned to work in oils. Time does not permit me to describe in detail each project.

The one that comes the nearest to being as successful as oil painting, as was evident by the product, was the making of papier-mache masks. I purposely directed the making of these to achieve an unrealistic effect. They were encouraged to be inventive: adding extra features, devising grotesque emotions, and exaggerating elements by using unusual sizes, shapes and colors. The results were gratifying because each was unique and personal and were as original as those found in primitive cultures. If they were aware that such masks existed in museums, they did not show it - the results of their efforts appeared to be completely original and self-motivated.

The success of water color painting could be seen only from those who were able to grasp the unique characteristic of the medium:

to emulate the fluid atmospheric colors and effects found in nature. Those that tried to copy a landscape rather than render an impression, soon gave up. Block printing, clay sculpture, and scratch board drawing produced interesting results from a few. Those few clearly displayed a sense of design and a feeling for the abstract and kept their products oriented toward conceptual rather than perceptual ends.

To some extent, all of the media that I have mentioned produced some successes. The one technique that lost their interest and produced extremely poor results was drawing from a model. This had been a particularly successful lesson in my public school teaching and I anticipated that it would produce the same results here. The demonstration consisted of showing how to use charcoal and paper to copy an object that appeared before them. Because I was reluctant to use them as models, I pressed the interns into service. Very quickly I discovered their interest was lagging: they began talking and telling jokes to one another and their drawing remained incomplete. I tried to maintain an interest by using girl interns as models, but even this lost its appeal. I cannot remember having any pictures that either they or I could say were successful from this lesson. What had happened?

At the time I laid it to a lack of skill on their part and a poorly presented demonstration on mine. It was not until later that I realized what I had done. I had unknowingly forced them back into a situation where they knew the rules. Even though it is a false criterion, a high school student's talent is often measured, by adults as well as his peers, by how well he can draw. The goal, as they see it, is photographic realism. Without this skill, our charges quickly realized how poorly they were performing. They knew how little their drawings looked like the model.

From this incident and from the partial successes of other lessons, I was forced to draw this conclusion. For the type of boy with whom we were dealing, if we hoped to achieve success, we must avoid approaches in which he could measure how well he was doing. This correlation, success in abstract areas and increasing failure as realism was approached, could not be ignored.

This is not to say that a certain media should be discarded because of its representational outcome. Only that the direction, approach, and outcome should be carefully planned and controlled. In fact, I have a new approach to figure drawing which I am certain will be effective. This scheme involves the use of all the senses, rather than just the visual, to create, not realistic figures, but impressions of action and direction.

All we did in the art program was not as simple and clear-cut as this dialogue indicates. The boys did not become, overnight, model students. There were problems that were never resolved such as clean up, finishing work, and inter-group frictions. All that I have tried to do is give you a picture of the general fabric by showing you what and how and in a few instances the why of our program.

[LDS:] Finally, what about the core problem - re-shaping attitudes? What's the effect, on boys whose past experience probably pre-disposes them to look on art as effete - though I'm sure they wouldn't describe it in such turgid prose! - on boys whose earlier experience, if any, with artist types probably reinforced the cultural stereotype of the artist as, at best, a pansy! Here we saw, or think we saw, a favorable effect, an interaction of all aspects of the program: the campus, a place devoted to the pursuit of learning; interns, attractive, interested and very alive young adults not too much older than the boys themselves, actually intending to teach, spending time and

energy on learning and demonstrably interested in these boys. Finally, the Art Instructor - not only seriously and unabashedly interested in ART, but, for God's sake, acting on the assumption that they were too!

I'm sure there's more to all that went on; what we're giving, though, are all the data that are accessible to us - our perceptions of the processes we started in motion. The boys accomplished a lot; they clearly enjoyed what they were doing and worked at it avidly (in the process, incidentally, shattering several of our preconceptions). Bob mentioned that we assumed such boys would, of course, have a short attention span and we worried about an uninterrupted period of an hour to an hour and a half of studio time. The evidence, you know, would suggest a short attention span, especially in such an activity. Well, it turns out that after ninety minutes or two hours, we had to drive them out of the studio! The shattering of this particular preconception, among many others, may have been among the most valuable side-effects of our experience.

They also took great pride in their accomplishments and in their contributions - considerable - to the Colgate summer session program. The impact of their experience on the Camp itself was subtle, but sweeping. Education, and going to school, became respectable topics of conversation. Further, and perhaps we'd say unfortunately, we gave them an unrealistic view of college life: "Man, we had a ball," and cruelly raised their aspirations to unrealistic heights. For some, perhaps so. Those are the silent, unrecognized failures - or breaches - in our intent. But if you'll accept the testimony of the boys themselves as valid, the overwhelming evidence is to the contrary. They said, in many ways and in many settings, that it was the most interesting, most exciting AND

most rewarding thing they'd ever done. And in their own, inimitable style, they acknowledged that it did open new horizons - vistas they never realized existed - if only the rather unusual ambition of laying a college girl, for instance! A better example, though, is their response to an astronomy lecture one evening. They dutifully filed past the telescope, set to observe the moon's surface. It was an . . activity we thought would be novel, "interesting" and valuable; by their passive but unnaturally quiet queing up for it they clearly portrayed their definition of the activity as typical adult Mickey Mouse. Afterwards, however, in the open, they flocked around our astronomer, posing all kinds of fundamental questions ranging from how many "universes" exist "out there" to a discussion dealing with geological time and continental drift that quickly lost me.

Of course these subjective data don't validate our hypothesis that by such an intangible assault we've really altered their value systems - that we've made them more like us "good guys!". For those among you who want hard data, let me briefly report on what's happened to the boys who've been involved: Two groups, in separate summers, though differently selected each summer.

From the summer of 1964, eleven students. About two years later, one is in jail, one unknown, lost to any record-keeping agency (which may, of course, suggest a positive outcome) and one in a mental hospital, as a drug addict. A fourth is in the service; depending on your own value system, you can count him as a success or a failure! Five are in school, one of these attending college (though of course he shouldn't be, if he knew enough about his educational aptitute and achievement level). As of early this spring, one was in a Job Corps Training Center in Arizona, and one of the original group is working.

Those eleven, attending in the summer of 1964, represented the 'cream' - the best of the boys resident in the Camp at that time, as judged by the staff. They were selected by their counselors on the basis of their potential and their leadership within the camp. What we had done, of course, was to load that initial group with the best we could identify, the "gatekeepers".

For last year, however, more confident and more courageous, the group was randomly selected. On the basis of their log numbers, assigned as a boy enters the Division for Youth program, a group of ten was selected by taking every third name from this serial number list. The resultant group included only two in whom the counselors had any great confidence regarding successful participation. Of this group, we lost one on the second day, to a municipal court in New York City; he was replaced by the next number on the list. A second boy used the trip to Colgate as the first leg of an unauthorized trip to his home in Western New York; he simply eloped on the third afternoon - after his studio time, incidentally. In all, nine boys completed the program. What is their status now? Though our data are incomplete, as of six months ago, six were still involved in programs planned at their discharge from Camp Brace; three or four were attending school in the spring of 1966.

Despite the vast, rich range of demonstrable behavioral pathology our subjects possessed in their repertoire, we calculatedly ignored this facet. We've entitled our remarks, you'll recall "Where Emotions and Experiences Meet" to focus on how one copes with the problem of meeting the clientele - patients, students, subjects - where they are. Except for whatever information may have been revealed in conversations between interns and individual boys, we ignored their backgrounds and, indeed, their "problems". In part

this was expedient, but a larger reason, I hope, was our commitment to the idea that such issues were irrelevant. Believe me, there were some pretty bizarre interactions and some behavioral pathology demonstrated, but not all of this was on the part of the Camp Brace boys. I can't think of a better laboratory, incidentally, to demonstrate the transactional nature of psychological seduction than in such a group of culturally disadvantaged teen-age boys and young, presumably post-adolescent female graduate students! Those of you who may have read Claude Brown's MANCHILD ENTERS THE PROMISED LAND will immediately recognize what kinds of interactions I refer to. And talk about transference! Well!!!

But the point is, that without deliberate attempts to control for the potential disruption of such boys' acting out, this has been no problem. All of us, independently, have observed that in the initial encounters with our interns, the initiative was taken by the boys. The two groups almost completely reversed roles; the boys made great efforts, successfully, to put the interns at ease - I almost said, "to establish rapport"! On the strength of these past experiences, in the coming summer session [1966], we plan to define their role with intern groups as consultants - to teach, in effect, the interns from their past experiences in schools and with teachers.

I'm <u>not</u> leading to any easy, simplistic, or folksy conclusions. I don't, completely, accept the hypothesis that there are no bad boys - some of these kids are bastards. And, though I don't mean it quite as fundamentally or as dogmatically as it sounds, I don't want to imply either, that these boys are just like us. Only in the grossest sense, or philosophically, at the highest level of abstraction, in that they and we share a common humanity, is such a generalization true.

But what does seem to us to be true is that our challenge is not so outrageous as it seemed. We intended to, forcibly, wrench their value system - and found, to our surprise, a great willingness to be so transformed. I suggest that the real, meaning visible, differences are so magnified in our eyes that we exaggerate the latent conflict and presumed resistance to modifying their life styles. While it is difficult to document this impression, my own judgment is that these boys - and others who could also be clearly identified as culturally disadvantaged - are quite receptive to change and to "move up", if you will accept that phrase in its metaphorical sense, to middle class roles. If anything, they seem to be looking for the way.